

COMPARISON OF SOME PURITIES, FLATNESSES AND INJECTIVITIES

WALID AL-KAWARIT AND FRANÇOIS COUCHOT

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we compare (n, m) -purities for different pairs of positive integers (n, m) . When R is a commutative ring, these purities are not equivalent if R doesn't satisfy the following property: there exists a positive integer p such that, for each maximal ideal P , every finitely generated ideal of R_P is p -generated. When this property holds, then the (n, m) -purity and the (n, m') -purity are equivalent if m and m' are integers $\geq np$. These results are obtained by a generalization of Warfield's methods. There are also some interesting results when R is a semiperfect strongly π -regular ring. We also compare (n, m) -flatnesses and (n, m) -injectivities for different pairs of positive integers (n, m) . In particular, if R is right perfect and right self $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -injective, then each $(1, 1)$ -flat right R -module is projective. In several cases, for each positive integer p , all (n, p) -flatnesses are equivalent. But there are some examples where the $(1, p)$ -flatness is not equivalent to the $(1, p + 1)$ -flatness.

All rings in this paper are associative with unity, and all modules are unital. Let n and m be two positive integers. A right R -module M is said to be (n, m) -presented if it is the factor module of a free right module of rank n modulo a m -generated submodule. A short exact sequence (Σ) of left R -modules is called (n, m) -pure if it remains exact when tensoring it with any (n, m) -presented right module. We say that (Σ) is $(\aleph_0, m)$ -pure exact (respectively $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact if, for each positive integer n (respectively m) (Σ) is (n, m) -pure exact. Let us observe that the $(1, 1)$ -pure exact sequences are exactly the RD-exact sequences (see [11]) and the $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -exact sequences are the pure-exact sequences in the Cohn's sense. Similar results as in the classical theories of purity hold, with similar proofs. In particular, a left R -module is (n, m) -pure-projective if and only if it is a summand of a direct sum of (m, n) -presented left modules, and each left R -module has a (n, m) -pure-injective hull which is unique up to an isomorphism.

In this paper, we compare (n, m) -purities for different pairs of positive integers (n, m) . When R is commutative, we shall see that some of these purities are equivalent only if R satisfies the following property: there exists a positive integer p such that, for each maximal ideal P , every finitely generated ideal of R_P is p -generated. When this property holds, then (n, m) -purity and (n, m') -purity are equivalent if m and m' are integers $\geq np$. These results are obtained by using the following: if R is a local commutative ring for which there exists a $(p + 1)$ -generated ideal, where p is a positive integer, then, for each positive integer n , for each integer m , $n(p - 1) + 1 \leq m \leq np + 1$, there exists a (n, m) -presented R -module whose

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16D40, 16D50, 16D80.

Key words and phrases. (n, m) -pure submodule, (n, m) -flat module, (n, m) -injective module, (n, m) -coherent ring.

endomorphism ring is local. It is a generalization of the Warfield's construction of indecomposable finitely presented modules when R is not a valuation ring.

When R is semiperfect and strongly π -regular, we show that there exists an integer $m > 0$ such that, for any integer $n > 0$, each (n, m) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact if and only if there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that every finitely generated left ideal is p -generated.

As in [16] we define (n, m) -flat modules and (n, m) -injective modules. We also compare (n, m) -flatnesses and (n, m) -injectivities for different pairs of positive integers (n, m) . In particular, if R is a right perfect ring which is right self $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -injective, then each $(1, 1)$ -flat right R -module is projective. For many classes of rings, for each positive integer p , we show that the $(1, p)$ -flatness implies the $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flatness, but we have no general result. If R is a local commutative ring with a non finitely generated maximal ideal P satisfying $P^2 = 0$, then for each positive integer p , there exists an R -module which is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat (resp, $(\aleph_0, p)$ -injective) and which is not $(1, p + 1)$ -flat (resp, $(1, p + 1)$ -injective).

As in [16] we define left (n, m) -coherent rings. When R is a commutative locally perfect ring which is $(1, 1)$ -coherent and self $(1, 1)$ -injective, we show that R is an IF-ring, each $(1, 1)$ -flat R -module is flat and each $(1, 1)$ -injective R -module is FP-injective. For other classes of rings, for each positive integer p , we show that the left $(1, p)$ -coherence implies the left $(\aleph_0, p)$ -coherence, but we have no general result. If $R = V[[X]]$, the power series ring over a valuation domain V whose order group is not isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}$, then R is a $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -coherent ring which is not $(1, 2)$ -coherent.

1. (n, m) -PURE EXACT SEQUENCES

By using a standard technique, (see for instance [4, Chapter I, Section 8]), we can prove the following theorem, and similar results hold if we replace n or m with $\aleph_0$.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that R is an algebra over a commutative ring S and E is an injective S -cogenerator. Then, for each exact sequence (Σ) of left R -modules $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) (Σ) is (n, m) -pure;
- (2) for each (m, n) -presented left module G the sequence $\text{Hom}_R(G, (\Sigma))$ is exact;
- (3) every system of n equations over A

$$\sum_{j=1}^m r_{i,j} x_j = a_i \in A \quad (i = 1, \dots, n)$$

with coefficients $r_{i,j} \in R$ and unknowns $x_1, \dots, x_m$ has a solution in A whenever it is solvable in B ;

- (4) the exact sequence of right R -modules $\text{Hom}_S((\Sigma), E)$ is (m, n) -pure.

Propositions 1.2 and 1.3 can be deduced from [13, Theorem 1].

A left R -module G is called (n, m) -pure-projective if for each (n, m) -pure exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(G, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(G, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(G, C) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Similar definitions can be given by replacing n or m by $\aleph_0$. From Theorem 1.1 and by using standard technique (see for instance [4, Chapter VI, Section 12]) we get the following proposition in which n or m can be replaced by $\aleph_0$:

Proposition 1.2. *Let G be a left R -module. Then the following assertions hold:*

- (1) *there exists a (n, m) -pure exact sequence of left modules*

$$0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F \rightarrow G \rightarrow 0$$

where F is a direct sum of (m, n) -presented left modules;

- (2) *G is (n, m) -pure projective if and only if it is a summand of a direct sum of (m, n) -presented left modules.*

A left R -module G is called (n, m) -pure-injective if for each (n, m) -pure exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(C, G) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(B, G) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(A, G) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact.

If M is a left module we put $M^\# = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$. Thus $M^\#$ is a right module. It is the *character module* of M .

If A is a submodule of a left R -module B , we say that B is a (n, m) -pure essential extension of A if A is a (n, m) -pure submodule of B and for each nonzero submodule K of B such that $A \cap K = 0$, $(A + K)/K$ is not a (n, m) -pure submodule of B/K . If, in addition, B is (n, m) -pure injective, we say that B is a (n, m) -pure injective hull of A . In these above definitions and in the following proposition n or m can be replaced by $\aleph_0$.

Proposition 1.3. *The following assertions hold:*

- (1) *each left R -module is a (n, m) -pure submodule of a (n, m) -pure injective left module;*
 (2) *each left R -module has a (n, m) -pure injective hull which is unique up to an isomorphism.*

Proof. (1). Let M be a left R -module. By Proposition 1.2 there exists a (m, n) -pure exact sequence of right R -modules $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F \rightarrow M^\# \rightarrow 0$ where F is a direct sum of (n, m) -presented right modules. From Theorem 1.1 it follows that $(M^\#)^\#$ is a (n, m) -pure submodule of $F^\#$. By [3, Corollary 1.30] M is isomorphic to a pure submodule of $(M^\#)^\#$. So, M is isomorphic to a (n, m) -pure submodule of $F^\#$. By using the canonical isomorphism $(F \otimes_R -)^\# \cong \text{Hom}_R(-, F^\#)$ we get that $F^\#$ is (n, m) -pure injective since F is a direct sum of (n, m) -presented modules.

(2). Since (1) holds and every direct limit of (n, m) -pure exact sequences is (n, m) -pure exact too, we can adapt the method of Warfield's proof of existence of pure-injective hull to show (2)(see [11, Proposition 6]). We can also use [10, Proposition 4.5]. $\square$

Proposition 1.4. *Let R be a commutative ring and let (Σ) be a short exact sequence of R -modules. Then (Σ) is (n, m) -pure if and only if, for each maximal ideal P $(\Sigma)_P$ is (n, m) -pure.*

Proof. Assume that (Σ) is (n, m) -pure and let M be a (n, m) -presented R_P -module where P is a maximal ideal. There exists a (n, m) -presented R -module M' such that $M \cong M'_P$ and $M \otimes_{R_P} (\Sigma)_P \cong (M' \otimes_R (\Sigma))_P$. We deduce that $(\Sigma)_P$ is (n, m) -pure.

Conversely, suppose that (Σ) is the sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$. Let M be a (n, m) -presented R -module. Then, for each maximal ideal P , $(\Sigma)_P$ is (n, m) -pure over R since $M \otimes_R (\Sigma)_P \cong M_P \otimes_{R_P} (\Sigma)_P$. On the other hand, since $M \otimes_R (\prod_{P \in \text{Max } R} (\Sigma)_P) \cong (\prod_{P \in \text{Max } R} M \otimes_R (\Sigma)_P)$, $\prod_{P \in \text{Max } R} A_P$ is a (n, m) -pure

submodule of $\prod_{P \in \text{Max } R} B_P$. By [2, Lemme 1.3] A is isomorphic to a pure submodule of $\prod_{P \in \text{Max } R} A_P$. We successively deduce that A is a (n, m) -pure submodule of $\prod_{P \in \text{Max } R} B_P$ and B . $\square$

2. COMPARISON OF PURITIES OVER A SEMIPERFECT RING

In this section we shall compare (n, m) -purities for different pairs of integers (n, m) . In [7] some various purities are also compared. In particular some necessary and sufficient conditions on a ring R are given for the $(1, 1)$ -purity to be equivalent to the $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -purity.

The following lemma is due to Lawrence Levy, see [15, Lemma 1.3]. If M be a finitely generated left (or right) R -module, we denote by $\text{gen } M$ its minimal number of generators.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a ring. Assume there exists a positive integer p such that $\text{gen } A \leq p$ for each finitely generated left ideal A of R . Then $\text{gen } N \leq p \times \text{gen } M$, if N is a finitely generated submodule of a finitely generated left R -module M .*

From this lemma and Theorem 1.1 we deduce the following:

Proposition 2.2. *Let R be a ring. Assume there exists a positive integer p such that $\text{gen } A \leq p$ for each finitely generated left ideal A of R . Then, for each positive integer n :*

- (1) *each (n, np) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (2) *each (np, n) -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, n)$ -pure exact.*

Corollary 2.3. *Let R be a left Artinian ring. Then there exists a positive integer p such that, for each positive integer n :*

- (1) *each (n, np) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (2) *each (np, n) -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, n)$ -pure exact.*

Proof. Each finitely generated left R -module M has a finite length denoted by $\text{length } M$, and $\text{gen } M \leq \text{length } M$. So, for each left ideal A we have $\text{gen } A \leq \text{length } R$. We choose $p = \sup\{\text{gen } A \mid A \text{ left ideal of } R\}$ and we apply the previous proposition. $\square$

Let R be a ring and J its Jacobson radical. Recall that R is *semiperfect* if R/J is semisimple and idempotents lift modulo J .

Theorem 2.4. *Let R be semiperfect ring. Assume that each indecomposable finitely presented cyclic left R -module has a local endomorphism ring. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that, for each integer $n > 0$, each (n, np) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (2) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that, for each integer $n > 0$, each (np, n) -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, n)$ -pure exact;*
- (3) *there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that each $(1, q)$ -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(1, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (4) *there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that each $(q, 1)$ -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -pure exact;*
- (5) *there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that each indecomposable finitely presented cyclic left module is q -related;*

- (6) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that $\text{gen } A \leq p$ for each finitely generated left ideal A of R .*

Moreover, if each indecomposable finitely presented left R -module has a local endomorphism ring, these conditions are equivalent to the following:

- (7) *there exist two positive integers n, m such that each (n, m) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
 (8) *there exist two positive integers n, m such that each (m, n) -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, n)$ -pure exact;*

Proof. By Proposition 2.2 (6) $\Rightarrow$ (1). By Theorem 1.1 (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2), (3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) and (7) $\Leftrightarrow$ (8). It is obvious that (2) $\Rightarrow$ (4) and (2) $\Rightarrow$ (7).

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (5). Let C be an indecomposable finitely presented cyclic left module. Then C is $(q, 1)$ -pure-projective. So, C is a direct summand of a finite direct sum of $(1, q)$ -presented left modules. Since R is semiperfect, we may assume that these $(1, q)$ -presented left modules are indecomposable. So, by Krull-Schmidt theorem C is $(1, q)$ -presented.

(5) $\Rightarrow$ (6). Let A be a finitely generated left ideal. Then $R/A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^t R/A_i$ where, for each $i = 1, \dots, t$, A_i is a left ideal and R/A_i is indecomposable. We have the following commutative diagram with exact horizontal sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & \bigoplus_{i=1}^t A_i & \rightarrow & R^t & \rightarrow & \bigoplus_{i=1}^t R/A_i & \rightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \rightarrow & A & \rightarrow & R & \rightarrow & R/A & \rightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Since the right vertical map is an isomorphism, we deduce from the snake lemma that the other two vertical homomorphisms have isomorphic cokernels. It follows that $\text{gen } A \leq tq + 1$ because $\text{gen } A_i \leq q$ by (5). On the other hand, let P be a projective cover of R/A . Then P is isomorphic to a direct summand of R . We know that the left module R is a finite direct sum of indecomposable projective modules. Let s the number of these indecomposable summands. It is easy to show that $t \leq s$. So, if $p = sq + 1$, then $\text{gen } A \leq p$.

(8) $\Rightarrow$ (5). Let C be an indecomposable finitely presented cyclic left module. Then C is (m, n) -pure-projective. So, C is a direct summand of a finite direct sum of (n, m) -presented left modules. Since R is semiperfect, we may assume that these (n, m) -presented left modules are indecomposable. So, by the Krull-Schmidt theorem C is $(1, m)$ -presented. $\square$

A ring R is said to be *strongly π -regular* if, for each $r \in R$, there exist $s \in R$ and an integer $q \geq 1$ such that $r^q = r^{q+1}s$. By [3, Theorem 3.16] each strongly π -regular R satisfies the following condition: for each $r \in R$, there exist $s \in R$ and an integer $q \geq 1$ such that $r^q = sr^{q+1}$. Recall that a left R -module M is said to be *Fitting* if for each endomorphism f of M there exists a positive integer t such that $M = \ker f^t \oplus f^t(M)$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let R be a strongly π -regular semiperfect ring. Then:*

- (1) *each finitely presented cyclic left (or right) R -module is Fitting;*
 (2) *each indecomposable finitely presented cyclic left (or right) R -module has a local endomorphism ring.*

Proof. In [3, Lemma 3.21] it is proven that every finitely presented R -module is a Fitting module if R is a semiperfect ring with $M_n(R)$ strongly π -regular for all n . We do a similar proof to show (1).

(2). By [3, Lemma 2.21] each indecomposable Fitting module has a local endomorphism ring. $\square$

Corollary 2.6. *Let R be a strongly π -regular semiperfect ring. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that, for each integer $n > 0$, each (n, np) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (2) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that, for each integer $n > 0$, each (np, n) -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, n)$ -pure exact;*
- (3) *there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that each $(1, q)$ -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(1, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (4) *there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that each $(q, 1)$ -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -pure exact;*
- (5) *there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that each indecomposable finitely presented cyclic left module is q -related;*
- (6) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that $\text{gen } A \leq p$ for each finitely generated left ideal A of R .*

Moreover, if $M_n(R)$ is strongly π -regular for all $n > 0$, these conditions are equivalent to the following:

- (7) *there exist two positive integers n, m such that each (n, m) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (8) *there exist two positive integers n, m such that each (m, n) -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, n)$ -pure exact;*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5 each indecomposable finitely presented cyclic left R -module has a local endomorphism ring. If $M_n(R)$ is strongly π -regular for all n , then by [3, Lemmas 3.21 and 2.21] each indecomposable finitely presented left R -module has a local endomorphism ring. So, we apply Theorem 2.4. $\square$

Recall that a ring R is *right perfect* if each flat right R -module is projective.

Corollary 2.7. *Let R be a right perfect ring. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that, for each integer $n > 0$, each (n, np) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (2) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that, for each integer $n > 0$, each (np, n) -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, n)$ -pure exact;*
- (3) *there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that each $(1, q)$ -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(1, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (4) *there exist two positive integers n, m such that each (n, m) -pure exact sequence of right modules is $(n, \aleph_0)$ -pure exact;*
- (5) *there exist two positive integers n, m such that each (m, n) -pure exact sequence of left modules is $(\aleph_0, n)$ -pure exact;*
- (6) *there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that $\text{gen } A \leq p$ for each finitely generated left ideal A of R .*

Proof. For all $n > 0$, $M_n(R)$ is right perfect. Since each right perfect ring satisfies the descending chain condition on finitely generated left ideals, then $M_n(R)$ is strongly π -regular for all $n > 0$. We apply Corollary 2.6. $\square$

3. COMPARISON OF PURITIES OVER A COMMUTATIVE RING

In the sequel of this section R is a commutative local ring, except in Theorem 3.5. We denote respectively by P and k its maximal ideal and its residue field

Let M be a finitely presented R -module. Recall that $\text{gen } M = \dim_k M/PM$. Let F_0 be a free R -module whose rank is $\text{gen } M$ and let $\phi : F_0 \rightarrow M$ be an epimorphism. Then $\ker \phi \subseteq PF_0$. We put $\text{rel } M = \text{gen } \ker \phi$. Let F_1 be a free R -module whose rank is $\text{rel } M$ and let $f : F_1 \rightarrow F_0$ be a homomorphism such that $\text{im } f = \ker \phi$. Then $\ker f \subseteq PF_1$. For any R -module N , we put $N^* = \text{Hom}_R(N, R)$. Let $f^* : F_0^* \rightarrow F_1^*$ be the homomorphism deduced from f . We set $D(M) = \text{coker } f^*$ the Auslander and Bridger's dual of M . The following proposition is the version in commutative case of [14, Theorem 2.4]:

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that M has no projective summand. Then:*

- (1) $\ker f^* \subseteq PF_0^*$ and $\text{im } f^* \subseteq PF_1^*$;
- (2) $M \cong D(D(M))$ and $D(M)$ has no projective summand;
- (3) $\text{gen } D(M) = \text{rel } M$ and $\text{rel } D(M) = \text{gen } M$;
- (4) if $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ then
 $\text{gen } M = \text{gen } M_1 + \text{gen } M_2$ and $\text{rel } M = \text{rel } M_1 + \text{rel } M_2$.
- (5) $\text{End}_R(D(M))$ is local if and only if so is $\text{End}_R(M)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let M be a finitely generated R -module, s an endomorphism of M and $\bar{s}$ the endomorphism of M/PM induced by s . Then s is an isomorphism if and only if so is $\bar{s}$.*

Proof. If s is an isomorphism it is obvious that so is $\bar{s}$. Conversely, $\text{coker } s = 0$ by Nakayama lemma. So, s is surjective. By using a Vasconcelos's result (see [4, Theorem V.2.3]) s is bijective. $\square$

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that there exists an ideal A with $\text{gen } A = p+1$ where p is a positive integer. Then, for each positive integers n and m with $(n-1)p+1 \leq m \leq np+1$, there exists a finitely presented R -module $W_{p,n,m}$ whose endomorphism ring is local and such that $\text{gen } W_{p,n,m} = n$ and $\text{rel } W_{p,n,m} = m$.*

Proof. Suppose that A is generated by $a_1, \dots, a_p, a_{p+1}$. Let F be a free module of rank n with basis $e_1, \dots, e_n$ and let K be the submodule of F generated by $x_1, \dots, x_m$ where these elements are defined in the following way: if $j = pq + r$ where $1 \leq r \leq p$, $x_j = a_r e_{q+1}$ if $r \neq 1$ or $q = 0$, and $x_j = a_{p+1} e_q + a_1 e_{q+1}$ else; when $m = pn + 1$, $x_m = a_{p+1} e_n$. We put $W_{p,n,m} = F/K$. We can say that $W_{p,n,m}$ is named by the following $n \times m$ matrix, where $r = m - p(n-1)$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & \dots & a_p & a_{p+1} & 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{p+1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & \ddots & & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 & a_1 & \dots & a_p & a_{p+1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 & a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_r \end{pmatrix}$$

Since $K \subseteq PF$, $\text{gen } W_{p,n,m} = n$. Now we consider the following relation: $\sum_{j=0}^m c_j x_j = 0$. From the definition of the x_j we get the following equality:

$$\sum_{q=0}^{n-2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} c_{pq+i} a_i \right) e_{q+1} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^r c_{p(n-1)+i} a_i \right) e_n = 0.$$

Since $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a basis and $\text{gen } A = p+1$ we deduce that $c_j \in P$, $\forall j$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. So, $\text{rel } W_{p,n,m} = m$.

Let $s \in \text{End}_R(W_{p,n,m})$. Then s is induced by an endomorphism $\tilde{s}$ of F which satisfies $\tilde{s}(K) \subseteq K$. For each j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, there exists a family $(\alpha_{i,j})$ of elements of R such that:

$$(1) \quad \tilde{s}(e_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,j} e_i$$

Since $\tilde{s}(K) \subseteq K$, $\forall j$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, $\exists$ a family $(\beta_{i,j})$ of elements of R such that:

$$(2) \quad \tilde{s}(x_j) = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_{i,j} x_i$$

From (1), (2) and the equality $x_1 = a_1 e_1$ it follows that:

$$\sum_{q=1}^n \alpha_{q,1} a_1 e_q = \sum_{q=0}^{n-2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} \beta_{pq+i,1} a_i \right) e_{q+1} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \beta_{p(n-1)+i,1} a_i \right) e_n.$$

Then, we get:

$$\forall q, 1 \leq q \leq n-1, \quad \alpha_{q,1} a_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} \beta_{p(q-1)+i,1} a_i$$

$$\text{and} \quad \alpha_{n,1} a_1 = \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_{p(n-1)+i,1} a_i.$$

We deduce that: $\forall q$, $2 \leq q \leq n$, $\beta_{p(q-2)+p+1,1} \in P$ and $\beta_{p(q-1)+1,1} \equiv \alpha_{q,1} [P]$. So,

$$(3) \quad \forall q, 2 \leq q \leq n, \quad \alpha_{q,1} \in P.$$

Now, let $j = p\ell + 1$ where $1 \leq \ell \leq (n-1)$. In this case, $x_j = a_{p+1} e_\ell + a_1 e_{\ell+1}$. From (1) and (2) it follows that:

$$\sum_{q=1}^n (\alpha_{q,\ell} a_{p+1} + \alpha_{q,\ell+1} a_1) e_q = \sum_{q=0}^{n-2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} \beta_{pq+i,j} a_i \right) e_{q+1} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \beta_{p(n-1)+i,j} a_i \right) e_n.$$

Then, we get:

$$\forall q, 1 \leq q \leq n-1, \quad \alpha_{q,\ell} a_{p+1} + \alpha_{q,\ell+1} a_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} \beta_{p(q-1)+i,j} a_i$$

$$\text{and} \quad \alpha_{n,\ell} a_{p+1} + \alpha_{n,\ell+1} a_1 = \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_{p(n-1)+i,j} a_i.$$

We deduce that

$$\forall q, \ell, 1 \leq q, \ell \leq (n-1), \quad \alpha_{q,\ell} \equiv \beta_{p(q-1)+p+1,j} [P] \text{ and } \alpha_{q+1,\ell+1} \equiv \beta_{pq+1,j} [P],$$

whence $\alpha_{q,\ell} \equiv \alpha_{q+1,\ell+1} [P]$. Consequently, $\forall q$, $1 \leq q \leq n$, $\alpha_{q,q} \equiv \alpha_{1,1} [P]$ and $\forall t$, $1 \leq t \leq (n-1)$, $\forall q$, $1 \leq q \leq (n-t)$, $\alpha_{q+t,q} \equiv \alpha_{1+t,1} \equiv 0 [P]$ by (3). Let $\bar{s}$ be the endomorphism of $W_{p,n,m}/PW_{p,n,m}$ induced by s . If $\alpha_{1,1}$ is a unit then $\bar{s}$ is an isomorphism, else $\overline{\mathbf{1}_{W_{p,n,m}} - s}$ is an isomorphism. By Lemma 3.2 we conclude that either s or $(\mathbf{1}_{W_{p,n,m}} - s)$ is an isomorphism. Hence, $\text{End}_R(W_{p,n,m})$ is local. $\square$

Remark 3.4. Observe that $D(W_{1,n-1,n})$ is isomorphic to the indecomposable module built in the proof of [12, Theorem 2].

Theorem 3.5. Let R be a commutative ring. The following assertions hold:

- (1) Assume that, for any integer $p > 0$, there exists a maximal ideal P and a finitely generated ideal A of R_P such that $\text{gen}_{R_P} A \geq p + 1$. Then, if (n, m) and (r, s) are two different pairs of integers, the (n, m) -purity and the (r, s) -purity are not equivalent.
- (2) Assume that, there exists an integer $p > 0$ such that, for each maximal ideal P , for any finitely generated ideal A of R_P , $\text{gen}_{R_P} A \leq p$. Then:
 - (a) for each integer $n > 0$ the $(\aleph_0, n)$ -purity (respectively $(n, \aleph_0)$ -purity) is equivalent to the (np, n) -purity (respectively (n, np) -purity);
 - (b) if $p > 1$, then, for each integer $n > 0$, for each integer m , $1 \leq m \leq n(p-1)$, the (n, m) -purity (respectively (m, n) -purity) is not equivalent to the $(n, m+1)$ -purity (respectively $(m+1, n)$ -purity).

Proof. By Proposition 1.4 we may assume that R is local with maximal P . By Theorem 1.1 the (n, m) -purity and the (r, s) -purity are equivalent if and only if so are the (m, n) -purity and the (s, r) -purity.

(1). Suppose that $r > n$ and let $t = \min(m, s)$. Let q be the greatest divisor of $(r-1)$ which is $\leq t$ and $p = (r-1)/q$. Let A be a finitely generated ideal such that $\text{gen } A > p$. By way of contradiction, suppose that $W_{p,q,r}$ is (n, m) -pure-projective. By Proposition 1.2 $W_{p,q,r}$ is a summand of $\oplus_{i \in I} F_i$ where I is a finite set and $\forall i \in I$, F_i is a (m, n) -presented R -module. Since its endomorphism ring is local, $W_{p,q,r}$ is an exchange module (see [3, Theorem 2.8]). So, we have $W_{p,q,r} \oplus (\oplus_{i \in I} G_i) \cong (\oplus_{i \in I} H_i) \oplus (\oplus_{i \in I} G_i)$ where $\forall i \in I$, G_i and H_i are submodules of F_i and $F_i = G_i \oplus H_i$. Let $G = \oplus_{i \in I} G_i$. Then G is finitely generated. By [4, Proposition V.7.1] $\text{End}_R(G)$ is semilocal. By using Evans's theorem ([3, Corollary 4.6]) we deduce that $W_{p,q,r} \cong (\oplus_{i \in I} H_i)$. Since $W_{p,q,r}$ is indecomposable, we get that it is (m, n) -presented. This contradicts that $\text{rel } W_{p,q,r} = r > n$.

(2)(a) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.2.

(2)(b). There exist two integers q, t such that $m+1 = (q-1)(p-1) + t$ with $n \geq q \geq 1$ and $1 \leq t \leq p$. As in (1) we prove that $W_{p-1,q,m+1}$ is not (m, n) -pure-projective. $\square$

Remark 3.6. In the previous theorem, when there exists an integer $p > 1$ such that, for any finitely generated ideal A $\text{gen } A \leq p$, we don't know if the (n, m) -purity and the $(n, m+1)$ -purity are equivalent when $n(p-1)+1 \leq m \leq np-1$. If R is a local ring with maximal P with residue field k such that $P^2 = 0$ and $\dim_k P = p$ it is easy to show that each finitely presented R -module F with $\text{gen } F = n$ and $\text{rel } F = np$ is semisimple. So, the (np, n) -purity is equivalent to the $(np-1, n)$ -purity.

4. (n, m) -FLAT MODULES AND (n, m) -INJECTIVE MODULES

Let M be a right R -module. We say that M is (n, m) -flat if for any m -generated submodule K of a n -generated free left R -module F , the natural map: $M \otimes_R K \rightarrow M \otimes_R F$ is a monomorphism. We say that M is $(\aleph_0, m)$ -flat (respectively $(n, \aleph_0)$ -flat) if M is (n, m) -flat for each integer $n > 0$ (respectively $m > 0$). We say that M is (n, m) -injective if for any m -generated submodule K of a n -generated free right R -module F , the natural map: $\text{Hom}_R(F, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(K, M)$ is an epimorphism.

We say that M is $(\aleph_0, m)$ -injective (respectively $(n, \aleph_0)$ -injective) if M is (n, m) -injective for each integer $n > 0$ (respectively $m > 0$). A ring R is called *left self (n, m) -injective* if R is (n, m) -injective as left R -module.

If R is a commutative domain, then an R -module is $(1, 1)$ -flat (respectively $(1, 1)$ -injective) if and only if it is torsion-free (respectively divisible).

The following propositions can be proved with standard technique: see [16, Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 2.3]. In these propositions the integers n or m can be replaced with $\aleph_0$.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that R is an algebra over a commutative ring S and let E be an injective S -cogenerator. Let M be a right R -module. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) M is (n, m) -flat;
- (2) each exact sequence $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ is (n, m) -pure, where L and N are right R -modules;
- (3) for each (m, n) -presented right module F , every homomorphism $f : F \rightarrow M$ factors through a free right R -module;
- (4) $\text{Hom}_S(M, E)$ is a (n, m) -injective left R -module.

Proposition 4.2. *Let M be a right module. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) M is (n, m) -injective;
- (2) each exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow L \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ is (m, n) -pure, where L and N are right R -modules;
- (3) M is a (m, n) -pure submodule of its injective hull.

Proposition 4.3. *Let R be a commutative ring. Then an R -module M is (n, m) -flat if and only if, for each maximal ideal P , M_P is (n, m) -flat over R_P .*

Lemma 4.4. *Let M be p -generated right R -module where p is a positive integer. Then M is flat if and only if it is $(1, p)$ -flat.*

Proof. Only “if” requires a proof. Let A be a left ideal. Assume that M is generated by $x_1, \dots, x_p$. So, if $z \in M \otimes_R A$, $z = \sum_{i=1}^p x_i \otimes a_i$ where $a_1, \dots, a_p \in A$. Suppose that the image of z in $M \otimes_R R$ is 0. If A' is the left ideal generated by $a_1, \dots, a_p$, if z' is the element of $M \otimes_R A'$ defined by $z' = \sum_{i=1}^p x_i \otimes a_i$, then z (respectively 0) is the image of z' in $M \otimes_R A$ (respectively $M \otimes_R R$). Since M is $(1, p)$ -flat we successively deduce that $z' = 0$ and $z = 0$. $\square$

It is well known that each $(1, \aleph_0)$ -flat right module is $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -flat. **For each positive integer p , is each $(1, p)$ -flat right module $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat?**

The following theorem and Theorem 4.11 give a partial answer to this question.

Theorem 4.5. *Let p be a positive integer and let R be a ring. For each positive integer n , assume that, for each p -generated submodule G of the left R -module $R^n \oplus R$, $(G \cap R^n)$ is the direct limit of its p -generated submodules. Then a right R -module M is $(1, p)$ -flat if and only if it is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat.*

Proof. We shall prove that M is (n, p) -flat by induction on n . Let G be a p -generated submodule of the left R -module $R^{n+1} = R^n \oplus R$. Let π be the projection of R^{n+1} onto R and $G' = \pi(G)$. Then G' is a p -generated left module. We put

$H = G \cap R^n$. We have the following commutative diagram with exact horizontal sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M \otimes_R H & \rightarrow & M \otimes_R G & \xrightarrow{1_M \otimes \pi} & M \otimes_R G' & \rightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 \rightarrow & M \otimes_R R^n & \rightarrow & M \otimes_R R^{n+1} & \xrightarrow{1_M \otimes \pi} & M \otimes_R R & \rightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Let $u : G \rightarrow R^{n+1}$, $u' : G' \rightarrow R$, $w : R^n \rightarrow R^{n+1}$ be the inclusion maps and let $v = u|_H$. Then $(1_M \otimes u')$ is injective. Let H' be a p -generated submodule of H . By the induction hypothesis M is (n, p) -flat. So, $(1_M \otimes (v|_{H'}))$ is injective. It follows that $(1_M \otimes v)$ is injective too. We conclude that $(1_M \otimes u)$ is injective and M is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat. $\square$

Corollary 4.6. *Let p be a positive integer and let R be a ring such that each left ideal is $(1, p)$ -flat. Then, for each positive integer $q \leq p$, a right R -module M is $(1, q)$ -flat if and only if it is $(\aleph_0, q)$ -flat.*

Proof. Let the notations be as in the previous theorem. Since G' is a flat left R -module by Lemma 4.4, H is a pure submodule of G . Let $\{g_1, \dots, g_q\}$ be a spanning set of G and let $h_1, \dots, h_t \in H$. For each k , $1 \leq k \leq t$ there exist $a_{k,1}, \dots, a_{k,q} \in R$ such that $h_k = \sum_{i=1}^q a_{k,i} g_i$. It follows that there exist $g'_1, \dots, g'_q \in H$ such that $\forall k$, $1 \leq k \leq t$, $h_k = \sum_{i=1}^q a_{k,i} g'_i$. So, each finitely generated submodule of H is contained in a q -generated submodule. We conclude by applying Theorem 4.5. $\square$

Corollary 4.7. *Let R be a commutative local ring with maximal P . Assume that $P^2 = 0$. Let q a positive integer. Then:*

- (1) *each $(1, q)$ -flat module is $(\aleph_0, q)$ -flat;*
- (2) *each $(1, q)$ -injective module is $(\aleph_0, q)$ -injective.*

Proof. Let the notations be as in the previous theorem. We may assume that $G \subseteq PR^{n+1}$. Then G is a semisimple module and H is a direct summand of G . So, (1) is a consequence of Theorem 4.5.

(2). Let M be a $(1, q)$ -injective module. We shall prove by induction on n that M is (n, q) -injective. We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow & \text{Hom}_R(R, M) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}_R(R^{n+1}, M) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}_R(R^n, M) & \rightarrow 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 \rightarrow & \text{Hom}_R(G', M) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}_R(G, M) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}_R(H, M) & \rightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where the horizontal sequences are exact. By the induction hypothesis the left and the right vertical maps are surjective. It follows that the middle vertical map is surjective too. $\square$

By [9, Example 5.2] or [6, Theorem 2.3], for each integer $n > 0$, there exists a ring R for which each finitely generated left ideal is $(1, n)$ -flat (hence $(\aleph_0, n)$ -flat by Corollary 4.6) but there is a finitely generated left ideal which is not $(1, n+1)$ -flat. The following proposition gives other examples in the commutative case.

Proposition 4.8. *Let R be a commutative local ring with maximal ideal P and residue field k . Assume that $P^2 = 0$ and $\dim_k P > 1$. Then, for each positive integer $p < \dim_k P$, there exists:*

- (1) *a $(p+1, 1)$ -presented R -module which is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat but not $(1, p+1)$ -flat;*
- (2) *a $(\aleph_0, p)$ -injective R -module which is not $(1, p+1)$ -injective.*

Proof. (1). Let F be a free R -module of rank $(p+1)$ with basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_p, e_{p+1}\}$, let $(a_1, \dots, a_p, a_{p+1})$ be a family of linearly independent elements of P , let K be the submodule of F generated by $\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} a_i e_i$ and let $M = F/K$. Then $M \cong D(W_{p,1,p+1})$ (see the proof of Proposition 3.3). First, we show that K is a $(1, p)$ -pure submodule of F . We consider the following equation:

$$(4) \quad \sum_{j=1}^p r_j x_j = s \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} a_i e_i \right)$$

where $r_1, \dots, r_p, s \in R$ and with unknowns $x_1, \dots, x_p$. Assume that this equation has a solution in F . Suppose there exists ℓ , $1 \leq \ell \leq p$, such that r_ℓ is a unit. For each j , $1 \leq j \leq p$, we put $x'_j = \delta_{j,\ell} r_\ell^{-1} s (\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} a_i e_i)$. It is easy to check that $(x'_1, \dots, x'_p)$ is a solution of (4) in K . Now we assume that $r_j \in P$, $\forall j$, $1 \leq j \leq p$. Suppose that $(x_1, \dots, x_p)$ is a solution of (4) in F . For each j , $1 \leq j \leq p$, $x_j = \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} c_{j,i} e_i$, where $c_{j,i} \in R$. We get the following equality:

$$(5) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p r_j c_{j,i} \right) e_i = \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} s a_i e_i$$

We deduce that:

$$(6) \quad \forall i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p+1, \quad \sum_{j=1}^p r_j c_{j,i} = s a_i$$

So, if s is a unit, $\forall i$, $1 \leq i \leq p+1$, $a_i \in \sum_{j=1}^p R r_j$. It follows that

$$\dim_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} R a_i \right) \leq p$$

that is false. So, $s \in P$. In this case (4) has the nil solution. Hence M is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat by Proposition 4.1(2) and Corollary 4.7.

By way of contradiction suppose that M is $(1, p+1)$ -flat. It follows that K is a $(1, p+1)$ -pure submodule of F by Proposition 4.1. Since M is $(1, p+1)$ -pure-projective we deduce that M is free. This is false.

(2). Let E be an injective R -cogenerator. Then $\text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -injective but not $(1, p+1)$ -injective by Proposition 4.1(4). $\square$

In a similar way we show the following proposition.

Proposition 4.9. *Let R be a commutative local ring with maximal ideal P . Assume that $P^2 = 0$. Let M be a $(m, 1)$ -presented R -module with $m > 1$, let $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ be a spanning set of M and let $\sum_{j=1}^m a_j x_j = 0$ be the relation of M , where $a_1, \dots, a_m \in P$. If $p = \text{gen}(\sum_{j=1}^m R a_j) - 1 > 0$, then:*

- (1) M is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat but not $(1, m)$ -flat;
- (2) $\text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -injective but not $(1, m)$ -injective, where E is an injective R -cogenerator.

When R is an arithmetical commutative ring, i.e. its lattice of ideals is distributive, each $(1, 1)$ -flat module is flat and by [4, Theorem VI.9.10] the converse holds if R is a commutative domain (it is also true if each principal ideal is flat). However we shall see that there exist non-arithmetical commutative rings for which each

(1,1)-flat module is flat. Recall that a left (or right) R -module M is *torsionless* if the natural map $M \rightarrow (M^*)^*$ is injective.

Proposition 4.10. *For each ring R the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is right self $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -injective;
- (2) each finitely presented cyclic left R -module is torsionless;
- (3) each finitely generated left ideal A satisfies $A = 1 - \text{ann}(r - \text{ann}(A))$.

Proof. We prove (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) as [5, Theorem 2.3] and (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) is easy. $\square$

Theorem 4.11. *Let R be a right perfect ring which is right self $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -injective. Then each (1,1)-flat right module is projective.*

Proof. Let M be a (1,1)-flat right R -module. It is enough to show that M is flat. Let A be a finitely generated left ideal of R . Assume that $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ is a minimal system of generators of A with $n > 1$. Let $z \in M \otimes_R A$ such that its image in M is 0. We have $z = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \otimes a_i$, where $y_1, \dots, y_n \in M$, and $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i a_i = 0$. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, we set $A_i = \sum_{j \neq i}^n R a_j$. Then, $\forall i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $A_i \subset A$. For each finitely generated left ideal B we have $B = 1 - \text{ann}(r - \text{ann}(B))$. It follows that, $\forall i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $r - \text{ann}(A) \subset r - \text{ann}(A_i)$. Let $b_i \in r - \text{ann}(A_i) \setminus r - \text{ann}(A)$. Then $y_i a_i b_i = 0$. From the (1,1)-flatness of M we deduce that $y_i = \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} y'_{i,k} c_{i,k}$, where $y'_{i,1}, \dots, y'_{i,m_i} \in M$ and $c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,m_i} \in R$ with $c_{i,k} a_i b_i = 0$, $\forall k$, $1 \leq k \leq m_i$. It follows that $z = \sum_{i=1}^n (\sum_{k=1}^{m_i} y'_{i,k} \otimes c_{i,k} a_i)$. Let $A^{(1)}$ be the left ideal generated by $\{c_{i,k} a_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq m_i\}$. Then $A^{(1)} \subset A$; else, $\forall i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $a_i = \sum_{j=1}^n (\sum_{k=1}^{m_j} d_{i,j,k} c_{j,k} a_j)$ with $d_{i,j,k} \in R$; we get that $a_i b_i = \sum_{j=1}^n (\sum_{k=1}^{m_j} d_{i,j,k} c_{j,k} a_j b_i)$; but $a_j b_i = 0$ if $j \neq i$ and $c_{i,k} a_i b_i = 0$; so, there is a contradiction because the second member of the previous equality is 0 while $a_i b_i \neq 0$. Let $\{a_1^{(1)}, \dots, a_{n_1}^{(1)}\}$ be a minimal system of generators of $A^{(1)}$. So, $z = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} y_i^{(1)} \otimes a_i^{(1)}$ where $y_1^{(1)}, \dots, y_{n_1}^{(1)} \in M$, and z is the image of $z^{(1)} \in M \otimes_R A^{(1)}$ defined by $z^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} y_i^{(1)} \otimes a_i^{(1)}$. If $n_1 \leq 1$ we conclude that $z^{(1)} = 0$ since M is (1,1)-flat, and $z = 0$. If $n_1 > 1$, in the same way we get that $z^{(1)}$ is the image of an element $z^{(2)} \in M \otimes_R A^{(2)}$ where $A^{(2)}$ is a left ideal such that $A^{(2)} \subset A^{(1)}$. If $\text{gen } A^{(2)} > 1$ we repeat this process, possibly several times, until we get a left ideal $A^{(l)}$ with $\text{gen } A^{(l)} \leq 1$; this is possible because R satisfies the descending chain condition on finitely generated left ideals since it is right perfect (see [8, Théorème 5 p.130]). The (1,1)-flatness of M implies that $z^{(l)} = 0$ and $z = 0$. So, M is projective. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a ring property. We say that a commutative ring R is *locally $\mathcal{P}$* if R_P satisfies $\mathcal{P}$ for each maximal ideal P .

The following corollary is a consequence of Theorem 4.11 and Proposition 4.3.

Corollary 4.12. *Let R be a commutative ring which is locally perfect and locally self $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -injective. Then each (1,1)-flat R -module is flat.*

5. (n, m) -COHERENT RINGS

We say that a ring R is left (n, m) -coherent if each m -generated submodule of a n -generated free left R -module is finitely presented. We say that R is left $(\aleph_0, m)$ -coherent (respectively $(n, \aleph_0)$ -coherent) if for each integer $n > 0$ (respectively $m > 0$) R is left (n, m) -coherent. The following theorem can be proven with standard

technique: see [16, Theorems 5.1 and 5.7]. In this theorem the integers n or m can be replaced with $\aleph_0$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let R be a ring and n, m two fixed positive integers. Assume that R is an algebra over a commutative ring S . Let E be an injective S -cogenerator. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is left (n, m) -coherent;
- (2) any direct product of right (n, m) -flat R -modules is (n, m) -flat;
- (3) for any set Λ , R^Λ is a (n, m) -flat right R -module;
- (4) any direct limit of a direct system of (n, m) -injective left R -modules is (n, m) -injective;
- (5) for any exact sequence of left modules $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, C is (n, m) -injective if so is B and if A is a $(\aleph_0, m)$ -pure submodule of B ;
- (6) for each (n, m) -injective left R -module M , $\text{Hom}_S(M, E)$ is (n, m) -flat.

It is well known that each left $(1, \aleph_0)$ -coherent ring is left $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -coherent. **For each positive integer p , is each left $(1, p)$ -coherent ring left $(\aleph_0, p)$ -coherent?**

Propositions 5.2 and 5.3 and Theorem 5.4 give a partial answer to this question.

Proposition 5.2. *Let p be a positive integer and let R be a ring. For each positive integer n , assume that, for each p -generated submodule G of the left R -module $R^n \oplus R$, $(G \cap R^n)$ is the direct limit of its p -generated submodules. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is left $(1, p)$ -coherent;
- (2) R is left $(\aleph_0, p)$ -coherent.

Moreover, when these conditions hold each $(1, p)$ -injective left module is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -injective.

Proof. It is obvious that $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$.

$(1) \Rightarrow (2)$. Let Λ be a set. By Theorem 5.1 R^Λ is a $(1, p)$ -flat right module. From Theorem 4.5 we deduce that R^Λ is a $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat right module. By using again Theorem 5.1 we get (2) .

Let M be a $(1, p)$ -injective left module. By Theorem 5.1 $M^\#$ is a $(1, p)$ -flat right R -module. Then it is also $(\aleph_0, p)$ -flat. We deduce that $(M^\#)^\#$ is a $(\aleph_0, p)$ -injective left module. Since M is a pure submodule of $(M^\#)^\#$, it follows that M is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -injective too. $\square$

Proposition 5.3. *Let R be a commutative perfect ring. Then R is Artinian if and only if it is $(1, 1)$ -coherent.*

Proof. Suppose that R is $(1, 1)$ -coherent. Since R is perfect, R is a finite product of local rings. So, we may assume that R is local with maximal P . Let S be a minimal non-zero ideal of R generated by s . Then P is the annihilator of s . So, P is finitely generated and it is the sole prime ideal of R . Since all prime ideals of R are finitely generated, R is Noetherian. On the other hand R satisfies the descending chain condition on finitely generated ideals. We conclude that R is Artinian. $\square$

Except in some particular cases, we don't know if each $(1, p)$ -injective module is $(\aleph_0, p)$ -injective, even if we replace p by $\aleph_0$.

Theorem 5.4. *Let R be a ring which is right perfect, left $(1, 1)$ -coherent and right self $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -injective. Then each $(1, 1)$ -injective left module is $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -injective and R is left coherent.*

Proof. Let M be a left $(1, 1)$ -injective module. By Theorem 5.1 $M^\#$ is $(1, 1)$ -flat. Whence $M^\#$ is projective by Theorem 4.11. We do as in the proof of Proposition 5.2 to conclude that M is $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -injective.

For each set Λ , R^Λ is a $(1, 1)$ -flat right module by Theorem 5.1. It follows that R^Λ is a projective right module by Theorem 4.11. $\square$

Recall that a ring is *quasi-Frobenius* if it is Artinian and self-injective.

Corollary 5.5. *Let R be a quasi-Frobenius ring. Then, for each right (or left) R -module M , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) M is $(1, 1)$ -flat;
- (2) M is projective;
- (3) M is injective;
- (4) M is $(1, 1)$ -injective.

Proof. It is well known that (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3). By Theorem 4.11 (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) because R satisfies the conditions of this theorem, and it is obvious that (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) and the converse holds by Theorem 5.4. $\square$

We prove the following theorem as [2, Théorème 1.4].

Theorem 5.6. *Let R be a commutative ring and n, m two fixed positive integers. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is (n, m) -coherent;
- (2) for each multiplicative subset S of R , $S^{-1}R$ is (n, m) -coherent, and for each (n, m) -injective R -module M , $S^{-1}M$ is (n, m) -injective over $S^{-1}R$;
- (3) For each maximal ideal P , R_P is (n, m) -coherent and for each (n, m) -injective R -module M , M_P is (n, m) -injective over R_P .

Recall that a ring R is a *right IF-ring* if each right injective R -module is flat.

Theorem 5.7. *Let R be a commutative ring which is locally perfect, $(1, 1)$ -coherent and self $(1, 1)$ -injective. Then:*

- (1) R is coherent, self $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -injective and locally quasi-Frobenius;
- (2) each $(1, 1)$ -flat module is flat;
- (3) each $(1, 1)$ -injective module is $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -injective.

Proof. By Theorem 5.6 R_P is $(1, 1)$ -coherent and $(1, 1)$ -injective for each maximal ideal P . Let a be a generator of a minimal non-zero ideal of R_P . Then PR_P is the annihilator of a and consequently PR_P is finitely generated over R_P . Since all prime ideals of R_P are finitely generated, we deduce that R_P is Artinian for each maximal ideal P . Moreover, the $(1, 1)$ -injectivity of R_P implies that the socle of R_P (the sum of all minimal non-zero ideals) is simple. It follows that R_P is quasi-Frobenius for each maximal ideal P .

Let M be a $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -injective R -module. By Theorem 5.6 M_P is $(1, 1)$ -injective for each maximal ideal P . By Corollary 5.5 M_P is injective for each maximal ideal P . We conclude that R is self $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -injective and it is coherent by Theorem 5.6.

If M is $(1, 1)$ -injective, we prove as above that M_P is injective for each maximal ideal P . It follows that M is $(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ -injective.

The second assertion is an immediate consequence of Corollary 4.12. □

The following proposition is easy to prove:

Proposition 5.8. *A ring R is left $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -coherent if and only if each finitely generated right ideal has a finitely generated left annihilator.*

Example 5.9. *Let V be a non-Noetherian (commutative) valuation domain whose order group is not the additive group of real numbers and let $R = V[[X]]$ be the power series ring in one indeterminate over V . Since R is a domain, R is $(\aleph_0, 1)$ -coherent. But, in [1] it is proven that there exist two elements f and g of R such that $Rf \cap Rg$ is not finitely generated. By using the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Rf \cap Rg \rightarrow Rf \oplus Rg \rightarrow Rf + Rg \rightarrow 0$ we get that $Rf + Rg$ is not finitely presented. So, R is not $(1, 2)$ -coherent.*

REFERENCES

- [1] Anderson, M. and Watkins, J. ((1987)). Coherence of power series rings over pseudo-Bezout domains. *J. Algebra*, 107:187–194.
- [2] Couchot, F. ((1982)). Exemples d’anneaux auto fp-injectifs. *Comm. Algebra*, 10(4):339–360.
- [3] Facchini, A. ((1998)). *Module theory. Endomorphism rings and direct sum decompositions in some classes of modules*. Progress in Mathematics (Boston, Mass.). Birkhäuser, Basel.
- [4] Fuchs, L. and Salce, L. ((2001)). *Modules over Non-Noetherian Domains*. Number 84 in Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence.
- [5] Jain, S. ((1973)). Flatness and FP-injectivity. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 41(2):437–442.
- [6] Jøndrup, S. ((1971)). p.p.rings and finitely generated flat ideals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 28:431–435.
- [7] Puninski, G., Prest, M., and Rothmaler, P. ((1999)). Rings described by various purities. *Comm. Algebra*, 27(5):2127–2162.
- [8] Renault, G. ((1975)). *Algèbre non commutative*. Collection “Varia Mathematica”. Gauthier-Villars.
- [9] Shamsuddin, A. ((2001)). n -injective and n -flat modules. *Comm. Algebra*, 29(5):2039–2050.
- [10] Stenström, B. ((1967)). Pure submodules. *Ark. Mat.*, 7:159–171.
- [11] Warfield, R. ((1969)a). Purity and algebraic compactness for modules. *Pac. J. Math.*, 28(3):689–719.
- [12] Warfield, R. ((1970)). Decomposability of finitely presented modules. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 25:167–172.
- [13] Warfield, R. B. ((1969)b). Relatively injective modules. *unpublished paper*.
- [14] Warfield, R. ((1975)). Serial Rings and Finitely Presented Modules. *J. Algebra*, 37(2):187–222.
- [15] Wiegand, R. and Wiegand, S. ((1975)). Finitely generated modules over Bezout rings. *Pac. J. Math.*, 58(2):655–664.
- [16] Zhang, X., Chen, J., and Zhang, J. ((2005)). On (m, n) -injective modules and (m, n) -coherent rings. *Algebra Colloq.*, 12(1):149–160.

UNIVERSITÉ DE CAEN BASSE-NORMANDIE, CNRS UMR 6139 LMNO, F-14032 CAEN, FRANCE
E-mail address: `walid.al-kawarit@unicaen.fr`

UNIVERSITÉ DE CAEN BASSE-NORMANDIE, CNRS UMR 6139 LMNO, F-14032 CAEN, FRANCE
E-mail address: `francois.couchot@unicaen.fr`